

PENNSYLVANIA Ave CP 151

FILED  
JUL 30 1998

MAY 18 1998

MAY 8 1 57 PM '98

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF KITSAP

BY \_\_\_\_\_

THE CITY OF BREMERTON, a  
municipal corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

WILLIAM SESKO and NATACHA  
SESKO, and their marital  
community,

Defendants.

NO. 97-2-01749-3

JUDGMENT GRANTING  
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

THIS MATTER having come on regularly for hearing before the undersigned, plaintiff appearing through its counsel, Jane R. Koler of Casey & Pruzan, defendant appearing pro se, the Court having heard the evidence of plaintiff in support of the Complaint herein, having heretofore entered its Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and being advised in the premises, it is

ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

1. The City of Bremerton is entitled to a mandatory injunction requiring abatement of the nuisance on the Seskos property located at 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, Bremerton, Washington.

JUDGMENT GRANTING INJUNCTIVE RELIEF  
Page 1

LAW OFFICES  
CASEY & PRUZAN  
18TH FLOOR PACIFIC BLDG.  
720 THIRD AVENUE  
SEATTLE, WA 98104-1866  
(206) 462-2577

BREMERTON-006945

- 1           2.     The Seskos shall clean up the property located at 1701 Pennsylvania  
2           Avenue, Bremerton, Washington within 120 days, or by ~~August 22~~ <sup>SEP 16</sup>, 1998,  
3           by removing all objects, structures and materials stored on the property.  
4           They shall remove, or cause to be removed, all old airplanes, dilapidated  
5           vehicles, including boats, buses, and cars, tires, rusty tanks, rusty machine  
6           parts, junk piers, wooden pallets, concrete chunks, modular buildings,  
7           metal debris, storage tanks, old signs, the building on sled runners, old  
8           boats, a rusty barge, storage tanks, pontoons, rusty breakwater float,  
9           mattresses, styrofoam floats, portable buildings, a crane, rusty metal  
10          objects, metal scraps, and wood scraps. All things collected on the  
11          property must be removed.  
12  
13  
14          3.     The Seskos shall not use this property as a storage facility and cannot  
15          store objects of any kind on the property.  
16  
17          4.     The City of Bremerton needs to facilitate the cleanup of the property by  
18          issuing any necessary permits to authorize removal of the objects from the  
19          property.  
20  
21          5.     In ordering the Seskos to clean up their property, it is necessary to  
22          distinguish between the abatement of the nuisance and the cleanup of toxic  
23          contaminants. This order in no way obligates the Seskos to clean up toxic  
24          contaminants on the property. The Seskos are not required to eliminate or  
25

1 secure the concrete pit on their property. The Seskos cannot store objects  
2 in the concrete pit on their property.

3  
4 6. This Court will maintain jurisdiction over this case until the cleanup is  
5 accomplished.

6 Dated this 8<sup>th</sup> day of May, 1998.

7  
8  
9  
10 JAY B. ROOF, JUDGE  
11  
12  
13

14 Presented by:  
15 CASEY & PRUZAN

16 Jane Koler  
17 Jane Koler, WSBA No. 13541  
18 Attorney for Plaintiff

19  
20 Copy received; Notice of  
21 presentation waived:

22 William D. Sesko  
23 William Sesko, Pro Se

24  
25 JUDGMENT GRANTING INJUNCTIVE RELIEF  
Page 3

CP 145

FILED  
KITSAP COUNTY CLERK  
MAY 18 1998  
MAY 8 1 57 PM '98

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF KITSAP

THE CITY OF BREMERTON, a  
municipal corporation,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
WILLIAM SESKO and NATACHA  
SESKO, and their marital  
community,  
  
Defendants.

NO. 97-2-01749-3

FINDINGS OF FACT AND  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

THIS MATTER having come on regularly for hearing before the undersigned, plaintiff appearing through its counsel, Jane R. Koler of Casey & Pruzan, defendant appearing pro se, the court having heard the evidence and testimony of plaintiff in support of the Complaint herein, and considered the Trial Brief submitted by the City of Bremerton, and being fully advised in the premises,

NOW, THEREFORE, makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

Note: Order to be entered on <sup>May 8.</sup> ~~April 24~~, 1998, at 1:30 p.m.

1. The City of Bremerton issued a Cease and Desist Order to William and Natacha Sesko on February <sup>2</sup>~~5~~, 1995, which specified that a land use violation was

1 occurring because the Seskos were conducting an illegal junkyard on their property  
2 located at 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, Bremerton, Kitsap County, Washington.

3  
4 2. The Seskos appealed the Cease and Desist Order to the City of Bremerton  
5 Planning Commission, which upheld the Cease and Desist Order on April 18, 1995.

6 3. The Seskos next appealed the City of Bremerton Planning Commission  
7 Decision to the Bremerton City Council. On June 28, 1995, the Bremerton City Council  
8 upheld the Planning Commission Decision, which found that the Seskos were illegally  
9 operating a junkyard on their property, and the operation on the Sesko property was not  
10 a nonconforming storage yard.  
11

12 4. The Seskos appealed the June 28, 1995, Decision of the Bremerton City  
13 Council to the Kitsap Superior Court. The Kitsap County court case was dismissed for  
14 want of prosecution on December 4, 1996.

15 5. By virtue of prior administrative proceedings, certain findings have already  
16 been determined. It has been determined that the Seskos are operating an illegal  
17 junkyard on their property. Prior administrative proceedings determined that the Seskos  
18 were not operating a nonconforming storage yard on their property. The Seskos' land  
19 use appeal contesting such findings has been dismissed by the Kitsap County Superior  
20 Court. The Seskos' failure to proceed in the past action does not provide a defense in  
21 the present nuisance action.  
22  
23  
24

1           6.     The Seskos' alleged violations of the Bremerton Shoreline Management Act  
2 Master Program does not prevent the City of Bremerton from proceeding with the present  
3 nuisance action. The fact that the property might be contaminated does not affect the  
4 City's ability to maintain the present nuisance action. The contaminated condition of the  
5 property may have affected the purchase price.  
6

7           7.     The court finds that the property is a nuisance per se because the Seskos  
8 are illegally operating a junkyard on this property without a business license and without  
9 authorization under the City of Bremerton's Land Use Code.  
10

11           8.     Conditions on this property also constitute an actual nuisance.

12           9.     Evidence presented to the court provides abundant evidence that the  
13 collection of objects on the Sesko property unreasonably interferes with the ability of  
14 neighboring property owners to use and enjoy their land. The Seskos' property is  
15 covered with old ~~vehicles~~, dilapidated vehicles, including boats, buses, and cars, tires,  
16 rusty tanks, rusty machine parts, junk piers, wooden pallets, concrete chunks, modular  
17 buildings, metal debris, storage tanks, old signs, as well as a building on sled runners,  
18 old boats, a rusty barge, storage tanks, pontoons, a rusty breakwater float, mattresses,  
19 styrofoam floats, portable buildings, a crane, rusty metal objects, metal scraps, and wood  
20 scraps.  
21

22           At the trial, neighbors who live in the vicinity of the junkyard, provided compelling  
23 testimony that the junkyard unreasonably interferes with their ability to enjoy their  
24

1 properties and is resulting in actual and substantial harm because the property is an  
2 excellent habitat for rats and constitutes an attractive nuisance for children in the area.  
3 The collection of objects on the site lure children from the area to the site, and the  
4 junkyard site provides a dangerous setting for children's play.  
5

6 There is a well-grounded fear of injury to the City of Bremerton as a result of  
7 operating a junkyard on this property. Operating a junkyard on in this location  
8 endangers nearby property owners and poses a threat of irreparable harm to them. The  
9 photographic evidence constitutes overwhelming evidence that the collection of objects  
10 on the Sesko property diminishes the enjoyment of nearby property owners of their  
11 homes. Photographs show that this junkyard has a significant negative impact on the  
12 surrounding properties. The testimony of Dan Calnan, an appraiser, established that the  
13 junkyard has caused general devaluation of properties in the area, a circumstance which  
14 results in substantial injury to property owners living in the area. For the above reasons,  
15 the property constitutes an actual nuisance.  
16

17 10. The only remedy available to the City of Bremerton which will provide relief  
18 to the property owners living in the area is the issuance of a mandatory injunction which  
19 requires the Seskos to clean up their property by removal of all junk from their land. The  
20 Seskos are given 120 days to accomplish a cleanup of this property.  
21

22 Neighboring property owners have a right to use and enjoy their properties free  
23 from the disturbance created by the junkyard. Balancing the equities shows that  
24

1 issuance of an injunction is necessary to protect nearby property owners. The Seskos  
2 have no entitlement to run a junkyard in this location; the Bremerton Land Use Code  
3 does not allow a junkyard in the BP zone in which the Sesko property is located.  
4

5 In ordering the Seskos to clean up their property, it is necessary to distinguish  
6 between the abatement of the nuisance and the cleanup of toxic contaminants.

7 This order in no way obliges the Seskos to clean up toxic contaminants on the  
8 property. This order requires the Seskos to clean up all the junk (all objects and  
9 structures collected on their property) located on their property. The City needs to  
10 facilitate the cleanup of the property by issuing any necessary permits to authorize  
11 removal of the objects from the property.  
12

13 The Court will maintain jurisdiction over this case until the cleanup is accomplished.  
14 The Seskos cannot use this property as a storage facility and cannot maintain the  
15 collection of objects and structures on the property.


16 The Seskos will not be required to eliminate or secure the concrete pit on their  
17 property. Storage of junk or objects shall not be allowed in the concrete pit.  
18

### 19 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW


20 The City of Bremerton is entitled to a permanent mandatory injunction which  
21  
22  
23  
24

requires the Seskos to clean up their property by removing all objects from their property.

Dated this 20th day of May, 1998.

  
JAY B. ROOF, JUDGE

Presented by:  
CASEY & PRUZAN

  
Jane Koler, WSBA No. 13541  
Attorney for Plaintiff

Copy received; Notice of  
presentation waived:

  
William Sesko, Pro Se